







UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,120 10/04/2000		Sean Lyndersay	13768.170	7801
22913 75	590 06/30/2004	EXAMINER		
	NYDEGGER (F/K/A	DELGADO, MICHAEL A		
SEELEY)		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
60 EAST SOU'	TH TEMPLE SATE TOWER	2144		
	CITY, UT 84111	21.1	9	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)						
:		09/680,12	0	LYNDERSAY ET AL.						
Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit						
			A. Delgado	2144						
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).										
Status										
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2004.									
2a)□	This action is FINAL .	b)⊠ This action is n	on-final.							
3)[Since this application is in condition				e merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.										
Disposition of Claims										
4)🖾	4) Claim(s) 1,3-5,7-12 and 15-33 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.									
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.										
•	6) Claim(s) <u>1,3-5, 7-12 and 15-33</u> is/are rejected.									
/)∟ (8 [(8	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.									
•										
	on Papers	- F								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.										
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).										
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).										
11)	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119									
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreian priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).						
-	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:									
,	1. Certified copies of the priority	documents have bee	n received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No										
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage										
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).										
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.										
Attachment(s)										
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date										
3) Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or		5) Notice of Informal P		O-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:										

Art Unit: 2144

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 1, 3-12 and 15-33 are allowed. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: US Patent 5,941,947 by Brown teach about utilizing a frontend and backend servers approach to increase efficiency and robustness of a distributed data system. In Brown's invention a client is allowed to access a copy of a public folder that is located on any of the backend servers. In prior art, the complication of deciding which of the backend server that will be handling a particular request is the burden of the front-end server "gateway" (Brown Col 9, lines 10-36). In applicant's invention, a client when accessing a public folder is directed to access one particular backend server by a selection module (Figure 4) (Page 18, line23 to Page 21, line 5). The selection module within the front-end server requires less computation as the decision process is less complex when compare to the prior arts. The advantage in applicant invention is realized in the backend server having the ability to assist in the selection of other back end servers that are holding copies of the public folder. This approach reduces the burden on the selection module of the front-end server and allows a more even distribution of the selection task among the back end servers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2144

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-12, and 15-33 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-13, 19-24, 25-32 and 33-39 and 41-45 of copending Application No. 09/679720. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

Art Unit: 2144

Claim 1 of Application No. 09/679720 compares to claim 15 and 16 of Application No. 09/680120:

- a. The front end and back end server are both claimed;
- b. Requests are made for a content: In claim 15, request are made for the contents of private folder, home public folder an public folder;
- c. The resource identifier that is claimed is similar to claim16 that claims an URI;
- d. The mapping function of global catalog is similar to claim 16 where a directory uses a URI to identify one or more back end servers.
- e. The approach of always going back to one particular backend server (which is the invention) is claimed by both.

Claim 19 of Application No. 09/679720 compares to claim 21 Application No. 09/680120:

- a. The front end and back end server are both claimed;
- b. Requests are made for a content by client: In claim 21, client request;
- c. Check validity of request: This is similar to using a security token as claimed in 21,
- d. The mapping function of global catalog is similar to claim 21 where selection module is used to identify one or more back end servers. The use of the web inherently includes URI in client's request.
- e. The approach of always going back to one particular backend server (which is the invention) is claimed by both.

Art Unit: 2144

Claim 1 of Application No. 09/679720 compares to claim 28 of Application No. 09/680120:

Claim 15 and 28 of application are similar so the rationality that was applied to claim 15 is also applied for claim 28.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael S. A. Delgado whose telephone number is 703-305-8057. The examiner can normally be reached on 7.30 AM - 5.30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WILLIAM A CUCHLINSKI JR can be reached on (703)308-3873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER